

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To: GEOFFREY L. MELNICK G. E. EHRLICH (1995) LTD. 11 MENACHEM BEGIN STREET RAMAT GAN, ISRAEL 52 521		PCT WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)	
		Date of mailing (day/month/year) 19 SEP 2006	
Applicant's or agent's file reference 29083		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/IL05/00558	International filing date (day/month/year) 30 May 2005 (30.05.2005)	Priority date (day/month/year) 30 May 2004 (30.05.2004)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC: B41F 33/00 (2006.01); B41L 35/14 (2006.01) USPC: 101/483,488			
Applicant KORIT DIGITAL LTD.			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201	Date of completion of this opinion 26 July 2006 (26.07.2006)	Authorized officer Anthony Nguyen Telephone No. 703-308-0956
--	--	--

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IL05/00558

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

- ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
☐ a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ on paper
☐ in electronic form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/IL05/00558

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 8,9,15-36, 44-53	YES
	Claims 1-7, 10-14, 37-43	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims NONE	YES
	Claims 1-7, 10-14, 37-43	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-53	YES
	Claims NONE	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-7, 10-14 and 37-43 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Nigam (US 6,291,023). Nigam teaches the steps of contacting a surface to be printed with wetting composition and applying liquid ink on the surface to form an image (Nigam, col.5, lines 20-40).

Claims 1-7, 10-14 and 37-43 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Berndtsson et al. (US 2005/0098054) teaches the steps of contacting a surface to be printed with wetting composition and applying liquid ink on the surface to form an image (Berndtsson et al., see the abstract and paragraphs [0030] and [0032]).

Claims 8,9, 15-36 and 44-53 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Nigam (US 6,291,023). To modify the wet composition with the selection of desired weight, liquid ink composition, surface tension, solvent, boiling temperature for the solvent and the adhesion promoting agent would not involve an inventive step since the selection can be obtained through routine experimentation depending on the medium to be printed in order to get best possible print quality.

Claims 8,9, 15-36 and 44-53 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Berndtsson et al. (US 2005/0098054). To modify the wet composition with the selection of desired weight, liquid ink composition, surface tension, solvent, boiling temperature for the solvent or the adhesion promoting agent would not involve an inventive step since the selection can be obtained through routine experimentation depending on the medium to be printed in order to get best possible print quality.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/IL05/00558

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

Claim 43 is objected to under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(iii) as containing the following defect(s) in the form or contents thereof:
There is no proper antecedent basis for "the surface and catalyst for promoting said chemically interacting" (lines 2 and 3) .

The description is objected to as containing the following defect(s) under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(iii) in the form or contents thereof: the numerical reference "19" is assigned to the spraying nozzles (pages 48, 49 lines 2, 6) and an ironing unit (page 45, third paragraph). Additionally, the "raised portion" is assigned to both references "40" and "49". The above are simply examples of the errors present. Applicant is required to carefully review and eliminate all such errors.